



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
MARCH 16, 2006**

APPROVED REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT: Robert Littlefield, Councilman
Jeremy Jones, Vice Chairman
Eric Hess, Commissioner
E.L. Cortez, Design Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Kevin O'Neill, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

ABSENT:

STAFF: Mac Cummins
Al Dreska
Lusia Galav
Frank Gray
Corey Lew
Sherry Scott
Al Ward
Kira Wauwie
Greg Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Littlefield at 1:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed Members presented as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilman Littlefield read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTES APPROVAL

1. March 2, 2006 DRB Study Session Minutes
2. March 2, 2006 DRB Regular Meeting Minutes

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2006 REGULAR SESSION AND STUDY SESSION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

3. 81-DR-2005 New Retail Shops @ Fry's Center

Board Member O'Neill inquired regarding Board Member opinions of the proposed south elevation of shops B. Upon hearing none, Councilman Littlefield noted receipt of a speaker card from DeLynn Sands. Ms. Sands acknowledged that her questions have been addressed.

4. 103-DR-2005 Monarch Property - New Monopalm Cell Site

VICE CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 81-DR-2005 AND 103-DR-2005 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

5. 33-DR-2003#3 Main Street Plaza

Mac Cummins introduced the case, calling attention to a project material board.

Corey Lew, CPM Division, addressed Board Member comments presented at the previous DRB meeting. Highlights of the presentation included an aerial view of the site and surrounding area along with drawings illustrating revisions made to the project pursuant to Board Member comments.

In response to inquiry by Board Member O'Neill, Mr. Lew apologized that the incorrect site plan map was included in the project packet.

Recalling previous comments relating to the center corridor, Board Member D'Andrea expressed a continued desire to see a design element implemented into the project that would tie-in the plaza. He opined that there is an opportunity to make this a more exciting place and suggested carrying the design into that space, perhaps via pavers.

Mr. Lew explained the intent to keep the plaza as flexible as possible in terms of design. He cited the plans for the future museum and the possibility that the proposed museum would expand onto the plaza. Board Member D'Andrea expressed concerns regarding the plaza in the interim and opined that the plaza should be constructed to stand on its own as opposed to waiting for another building to be constructed.

In response to a request for clarification by Councilman Littlefield, Mr. Al Dreska confirmed that the reason for the noted flexibility regarding the plaza is due to the currently unknown factors relative to the proposed future construction of the museum. He opined that if and when built, the proposed western museum development would likely cover most of the plaza. He noted that Board Member D'Andrea's comments were considered by the developers, and pointed out that the desire is to maintain the curvilinear pattern established in Artist's Alley exclusively in Artist's Alley. The plaza is a small, open area, whose final use is yet to be determined. The area provides space to setup 40 small arts booths and can accommodate seating of approximately 300 folding chairs. He also noted the increase in costs of materials required to accommodate a curvilinear pattern in a Canterra.

Councilman Littlefield confirmed that many aspects of the museum plans are yet to be determined and acknowledged that it could be years before the museum is constructed.

Referring to one of the examples included in project packet regarding concert seating, Board Member O'Neill questioned whether an arrangement of this nature would be effective on a flat plaza. Mr. Dreska opined that the location would likely never serve as a concert venue but could be effectively used for some form of musical performance conducted off of a portable elevated stage.

Board Member O'Neill questioned the tennis court overlay included in the packet. Mr. Dreska noted that the site is not intended to be used as a tennis court; the inclusion of the tennis court overlay in the packet was intended to provide the Board with a reference to the true size of the space.

In response to further inquiries by Board Member O'Neill, Mr. Dreska explained that the round elements toward the top of the wall are built-in wall lights. The selected Arizona Ash tree is consistent with the theme that will be in the landscaping developed around the Main Street Plaza complex.

In response to inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea, Mr. Dreska explained that the City entered into a development and cost participation agreement with the developer several years prior and are funding the cost of the parking facility.

Board Member D'Andrea reiterated that an opportunity is being missed to create a nice space and queried whether the developer has seen and approved this design.

Peter Petcus, Arts District Group, addressed the Board. The material being used is consistent with the material used on the private side of the development. Improvements to the plaza are being funded by the City. He noted that the group considered alternative patterns for the plaza and reported that for several reasons including drainage conflicts, the group elected to agree with the designers that the surface needs to be consistently drained and a consistent material. The trees depicted in the rendering are in raised planters, providing relief between the level of the plaza and the level of the planters. There are three steps on the west end and the plaza slopes to the east, providing a zero point for both handicap access and drainage. With the prospect of the potential cultural use to the east of the plaza area, he opined that adding any additional improvements without defining the specific use that may potentially utilize space currently reserved for the plaza, would be a waste of resources. The concrete columns on the underground garage were engineered and built to support a three-story structure

above the plaza. He opined that the proposed design and use of materials is a good option for both the short-term and the long-term aspects of the project. The plaza will be functional and attractive.

In response to inquiry by Councilman Littlefield regarding the anticipated use of the space prior to development of the museum, Mr. Petcus explained that the group embraces activation of the site and cited that short-term use of the plaza could include art fairs, farmer's markets and musical events. He noted the installation of power and water to facilitate use of the plaza, as well as a screened event storage area.

In response to request for confirmation by Councilman Littlefield, Mr. Petcus affirmed that the plaza is a City space and specific uses of the area are not limited to the suggested short-term uses.

Board Member O'Neill requested clarification of the eastern site boundary relative to Marshall Way. Mr. Petcus explained that the eastern boundary is 100 feet from the edge depicted on the drawing. The City owns the property between the eastern boundary of the project and Marshall Way. Pursuant to the redevelopment agreement, the land is a dedicated cultural use.

In response to inquiry by Board Member O'Neill regarding the metal ballards, Mr. Petcus explained that temporary ballards and chains are included in the design along the eastern edge in order to restrict the land from being used as a parking lot. Discussions continue with City staff regarding what will be done on this site prior to development. Vehicular access has been restricted to the plaza.

Board Member Cortez expressed favor for the installation of infrastructure in the plaza. He expressed concern regarding the City's potential liability as it relates to the elevation differential on the south side of the plaza and inquired regarding the possibility of resolving the differential. Mr. Dreska explained that the design of the stairs evolves from matching the grade at the northern edge of the existing bus turnaround area, which is part of the transit center. The varying amount of stairs is a function of the existing grade that a relatively flat plaza area must tie into with the sidewalk below.

Citing that in most codes a single step is considered a tripping hazard, Vice-Chairman Jones asked if the Code has been viewed to verify the legality of a single step. Peter Cure project designer, argued that this project is not the first project done by the designer that includes a single step. He opined that the change in materials helps to identify the step and reiterated specific points highlighted by Mr. Dreska regarding the issue.

Board Member Jones reiterated concerns regarding the legality of the issue and requested that the matter be reviewed. Mr. Cure deferred to the City's review of the matter and suggested the possibility of ramping up into the other single step; however, doing so would not meet handicap ramp requirements.

In response to a request for clarification on the legality of the issue by Councilman Littlefield, Mr. Dreska committed to verify the status with the chief building official and will provide an alternative to single step access points if deemed necessary to do so.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CASE 33-DR-2003# 3, MAIN STREET PLAZA, WITH A STIPULATION THAT THERE NOT BE ANY INSTANCES WHERE THERE IS JUST A SINGLE STEP. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT, THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ONE (1). BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA DISSENTED.

6. 83-DR-2005 Orange Row Condominiums

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 83-DR-2005, ORANGE ROW CONDOMINIUMS. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HESS, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

Ms. Galav noted that the case is being continued to April 20th.

7. 118- DR-2005 Saint Patrick's Church/Office Building

Councilman Littlefield noted receipt of feedback from the neighbors opining a lack of sufficient notification due to the placement of the notification signage.

In response to inquiry by Councilman Littlefield, Mr. Larry, 8608 E. Gail Road, expressed a preference to continue the matter, citing that several concerned neighbors were unable to attend the DRB meeting. He expressed dissatisfaction regarding the posted signage and lack of community awareness regarding notification of the DRB meeting.

In response to inquiry by Board Member O'Neill regarding the status of receiving notification from the City about the DRB meeting, Mr. Heath stated that he could not recall receiving notice in the form of a postcard.

Upon inquiry by Commissioner Hess regarding an estimate of the number of other concerned neighbors that would like to address the Board regarding the issue, Mr. Health cited traffic concerns and identified an additional 3 to 4 citizens in his neighborhood. Further discussion regarding the opportunity to express citizen concerns ensued.

Board Member D'Andrea asked if there is any major objection to the building or the site planning, noting that those concerns are perhaps more significant than the sign posting issue. In response, Mr. Heath expressed favor with the church's willingness to meet with the neighbors and offer concessions; however, many recent issues have arisen that have not been addressed by neighbors. A continuance would assist concerned neighbors in a variety of ways.

Commissioner Hess asked if the issues and communication between the church and the neighbors are such that the issues could be resolved with additional time, prior to returning to the Board. Mr. Heath explained that he wants nothing more than a cohesive working relationship with this church and resolving the issues is the goal. Commissioner Hess suggested granting a continuance, providing that the issues can be satisfactorily worked out between all parties.

Brief discussion followed regarding a continuance. Joe Hernandez, Facility Manager for St. Patrick's Church, expressed surprise regarding the implication of any new issues as

the church has been working closely with the neighbors. Mr. Hernandez expressed a desire to continue the DRB hearing as opposed to a continuance of the matter.

Curtis Pyle, 8542 E. Mercer Land, citing shaded parking structures, opined that new issues have arisen that need to be addressed and expressed favor for continuing the matter.

In response to request by Commissioner Hess to identify the specific issues, Mr. Pyle cited a request for structured parking, and demolition of an existing fence and reconstruction of the fencing at a height of 8-feet.

Councilman Littlefield requested that Mr. Pyle specifically identify only new issues that have not previously been discussed between the parties. Ms. Galav clarified that covered parking is not included in the current application before the Board.

Upon inquiry of Board Members by Councilman Littlefield, the decision was made to move forward with the public hearing.

Alan Ward, Senior Planner, introduced the case pursuant to the staff packet. Highlights of Mr. Ward's presentation included an overview of the City's standard notification process on Development Review Board cases. He noted that in this specific case a total of 247 neighbors were notified about the project. A community meeting was held on October 25, 2005, at the parish office; 23 people attended the meeting. One hundred-fifty "Heads-up" postcards were mailed to neighbors within a 750-foot radius of the church site, notifying citizens about the project. The proposal, a staff contact, a City website contact, a City general contact and an Applicant contact are listed on the "Heads-up" postcard. DRB meeting notices are posted at the site.

Brian Cassidy, project Architect, with CCBG Architects, addressed the Board. Highlights of the presentation included a brief history of the church site, the long-term master plan of the project, goals for achieving a larger office complex, site plans and elevations. Mr. Cassidy addressed concerns expressed by neighbors regarding the legitimacy of the church use of the property, parking, lighting, covered parking, youth activities, and noise.

In response to inquiry by Board Member D'Andrea regarding Fire Department access off of the cul-de-sac, Mr. Cassidy explained the intended access plan, confirming that the proposed gates would remain locked and only allowed to be opened by the Fire Department.

In response to comments and inquiry by Board Member O'Neill regarding the non-residential appearance of the development and lack of street presence, Mr. Cassidy confirmed that the current proposal reflects the desires of neighbors expressed during the neighborhood meeting.

In response to a question by Board Member O'Neill regarding FAR calculations, Mr. Ward explained the lot tie-in aspect of the case and confirmed that the calculations are based upon the full size of the lot and the full size of the proposed buildings.

Board Member Schmitt reported visiting the project and opined that the posting on this site was not different than other sites. Reading through the packet, he finds that due diligence has been put forth in working with the neighborhood and a number of points

were all addressed. Furthermore, at a recent point in time there was agreement between all of the parties that those conditions were acceptable. He expressed surprise that new issues have cropped up on a day of a meeting and opined that it seems unfair to an applicant who has been working hard to address those issues for several months. For those reasons, Board Member Schmitt is in support of the project.

Presenting the staff analysis, Mr. Ward summarized that staff has reviewed this matter against the church use criteria and are supporting the project. Staff suggests the following key issues and attached stipulations: approval is contingent on the lot-tie; all access would be from 85th Place and Mercer Lane; access would come through the existing church parking lot to the west and access the 32-space parking lot along the west side of the building; all pedestrian access would also be from the church side. All gates will remain closed with limited emergency access. Efforts have been extended to prevent cut-through traffic to the site. The walls, lighting, landscaping and height of the building are intended to conform with the neighborhood to the extent possible.

Commissioner Hess asked if there is any reason that construction traffic couldn't access the property via the newly created access points in an effort to avoid disturbing the neighbors. Mr. Ward affirmed that the suggestion would be appropriate.

In response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea regarding the structure depicted on the landscaping plan, Mr. Ward confirmed that the structure is an existing garage.

Board Member O'Neill requested clarification regarding the location of the block wall. Mr. Ward referred to the landscape plan and explained that the wall goes from the western boundary along the north side, extends along the north boundary and swings along the north side of the parking lot, comes over to the emergency vehicle access and then ties over to the edge of the building. The additional 6-foot tall patio wall is stipulated to tie back into the building, and contain limited access gates.

Councilman Littlefield opened the floor for public comment.

Larry Heath addressed the Board regarding the affects of the prior re-zoning of the property. He cited that the church has been irregular in their relationship with the neighbors over the years and noted issues relative to the church's population consisting of over 5,000 families.

Board Member O'Neill requested that the Mr. Heath address the issues related to the site plan and architecture. Mr. Heath expressed displeasure with the open gate between the church and the property to the north as well as a 10,000-foot office building in a residential area.

Curtis Pyle addressed the Board, requesting further stipulations prior to approval that would restrict the church from certain usages; particularly noting concerns regarding a proposed change to an 8-foot wall, multi-use facilities, and youth activities. He opined that the church has been very secretive regarding the expansion plans and expressed concern that once the project is approved, the Applicant will be able to make changes beyond the current plans. Mr. Pyle requested a continuance of the case in order to further stipulate certain usages and ensure that the usages cannot be changed in the future. Relative to the design of the project, Mr. Pyle expressed a preference for a residential look as opposed to a commercial project.

In response to inquiry by Councilman Littlefield regarding the contingency related to the 8-foot wall, Mr. Ward explained that the neighbors requested that the existing wall be increased to 8-feet. The church agreed to the increased height, but requested that with the increased height, covered parking be permitted on a certain number of stalls on the site. Mr. Ward confirmed that the issue is not part of the current request and would have to return to the Board for a subsequent approval.

Noting an understanding that the new proposed facility was for office use only and that the TI space would be renovated, Board Member D'Andrea asked if the church would be amenable to a stipulation specifically identifying the space for church office use only.

Mr. Hernandez explained that the reason the church is not in favor of that type of restriction is because the youth groups perform administrative tasks. He also cited that the chapel is used for prayer sessions and certain age groups should not be restricted from using the chapel. The intention is to remodel the old Finland Hall and use the facility for youth activities. The church is not prepared to agree to that type of restriction, but has agreed to mitigate all noise and abate any type of disruptions.

Board Member D'Andrea expressed concern regarding activities of the large youth groups and reiterated that the proposed administrative offices fits much better into the neighborhood than housing of the youth program. Mr. Hernandez reiterated points previously stated.

Frank Gray pointed out that the expanded home on the site has an occupancy limit of 25 to 30 people. Board Member D'Andrea asked if the occupancy limit includes outdoor activities. Mr. Gray confirmed that the occupancy limit relates only to the structure and explained that the parking area would be the only outdoor area available.

Tami Harris, 7718 N. Via de Fonda, briefly addressed the Board regarding area growth and requested approval of the proposed plan.

Susan Wheeler, 9616 E. Kalil, opined that because churches are not required to obtain use permits, it is important that the conformance stipulations are defined at the DRB level. Ms. Wheeler spoke in favor of the neighborhood, citing issues for DRB consideration such as hours and youth activities. She opined that large churches should move to commercial areas and requested that the Board impose a stipulation on the use of the building, hours of use, and that lights must be out by a certain time.

Avery Harris, 7718 N. Via de Fonda, submitted a comment card, but did not wish to speak.

Steve Macy, 10642 N. 85th Place, addressed the Board. Addressing previous comments by Board Member Schmitt, Mr. Macy provided details relative to correspondence exchanges between the parties and opined that the issues of noise, the youth groups and stipulations have absolutely not been worked out between the church and the neighbors. Mr. Macy argued that if the issues are not stipulated to, the City cannot become involved in the future.

Councilman Littlefield noted receipt of a card from Frank Bulino, who did not wish to speak but is in favor of the item.

In rebuttal, Mr. Hernandez referred Board Members to a letter citing agreement by the church to restrict any gatherings or meetings to 10:00 p.m., exclusive of certain holy days, as previously outlined to the City and the neighbors. The church has also agreed to uphold the peace and quiet of the neighborhood and the church invites the City to add those specifics to the stipulations.

Requesting clarification, Board Member O'Neill observed that this matter is a Development Review Board case which deals with site plans, architecture, elevations, colors and other similarly related issues; not a use permit or land use issue hearing. Board Member O'Neill cited that the majority of the expressed issues appear to be land use issues, which is beyond the scope of this Board.

Sherry Scott confirmed that Board Member O'Neill's observation is correct. The zoning ordinance sets out the uses that are allowed on the property, which do include a church. The purview of this Board is to look at the design elements as listed in the zoning ordinance and those criteria.

In follow-up, Board Member O'Neill requested clarification as to what qualifies as a church. Ms. Scott referred to the definition of church in the zoning ordinance and explained that because this case involves the lot-tie-in, this facility would likely be considered an accessory use for the church. Accessory use is defined as any use that is secondary to the primary use.

Citing concerns expressed by neighbors and expressing empathy for the unresolved issues, Board Member O'Neill asked whether there is any opportunity for the residents to participate in the lot-tie-in process. He also asked if an office use would be allowed on the site in the event that the lot-tie was not granted.

Ms. Scott stated that there is not a process for the residents to participate in the lot-tie-in issue. Ms. Scott reiterated that the project issues currently before the Board relate to the design of this project.

Board Member D'Andrea noted that the Board is not challenging land-use, and asked whether the issue of youth group activities is a land use issue and could be addressed in a stipulation by the DRB. Ms. Scott articulated that land uses are set forth in the zoning ordinance. Pursuant to the criteria that the Board is allowed to review in the zoning ordinance, the Board has the right to enact stipulations with regard to design to the extent that the Board is concerned about the design of a project because of a use that is going to be potentially undertaken on this project.

In response to clarification comments by Councilman Littlefield regarding opportunities for the public to comment on the project, Ms. Scott confirmed that the DRB hearing is the only opportunity provided for neighbors to address the project. Mr. Gray reiterated that the land use is controlled by the zoning; zoning allows churches in a residential district. Ms. Scott opined that it might be helpful for the Board to know that the church has agreed to restrict any gatherings or meetings beyond 10:00 p.m.

Discussion ensued upon comments by Commissioner Hess regarding the implication of the proposed 10:00 p.m. stipulation and the opening of the door for the Board to expand on that stipulation, although that stipulation does not apply to architectural or design issues.

Ms. Scott explained that if the church is willing to agree to a stipulation restricting their hours of use, this constitutes a voluntary stipulation that they are willing to enter into; however, agreement to a voluntary stipulation does not waive their right not to agree to other stipulations. The Board can invoke involuntary stipulations that relate to design concerns or issues.

In response to a request for clarification by Board Member Cortez, Ms. Scott confirmed that the Board cannot impose zoning restrictions via a stipulation.

Referring to the "Response to Neighbors Requests", Board Member D'Andrea expressed understanding of the neighbors concerns. He cited examples of the open-ended responses by the church and opined that if there are not stipulations that can be placed on the project, he cannot support the project because there will never be any recourse or safety for the neighbors in terms of what goes on at this facility.

Councilman Littlefield identified that the major problem with residential church uses for neighbors relates to the large sizes of churches in today's society. The impact upon the neighbors is not mitigated by the fact that a large facility is a religious institution. He expressed concurrence with comments by Board Member D'Andrea and a preference for the church and the neighbors to work through and resolve the issues. Councilman Littlefield will not support a motion to approve, but will support a motion to continue.

Mr. Gray clarified that the largest conference room would hold an occupancy load of 88 to 90 people.

In response to inquiry by Vice-Chairman Jones regarding the motion, Councilman Littlefield clarified that the motion to approve the case should include any stipulations requested by the Board.

Board Member Schmitt suggested that the Applicant and neighbors review the 16 points and form those points into stipulations that would be acceptable to both sides, prior to seeking approval by the Board. He suggested that the matter be continued for two weeks.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the terms of the continuance. Whereupon,

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 118-DR-2005 TO APRIL 6, 2006 TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD TO WORK ON RESTRUCTURING THE 16 ITEMS LISTED INTO AMENABLE STIPULATIONS THAT CAN BE ATTACHED TO THE CASE. COMMISSIONER HESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Referring to the design of the building, Board Member O'Neill requested that the architect and the Applicant work on the design of the building to make the building more suitable for a residential neighborhood. He requested that the building appear to be a residence to passers by as opposed to an accessory building to a church.

Ms. Galav noted that April 6th is not sufficient time for the requested architectural review and suggested that the motion be amended for an April 20th review.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA MODIFIED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE COMMENTS BY BOARD MEMBER O'NEILL AND A CONTINUANCE TO THE APRIL 20TH DRB MEETING.

Vice-Chairman Jones expressed opposition to the motion, opining that the Board is focused on issues that are not appropriate to the Development Review Board. He noted that the neighbors have had a chance to be heard, have served a very important purpose, their comments are on record, and the church has addressed several issues presented by the community. He cited that the church is going to comply to all of the rules that apply to churches and the church has behaved within the program and method of operation as set out by the City. He opined that people are taking advantage of the church in this case and it therefore opposed to continuing the case.

THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO TWO (2). VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES AND BOARD MEMBER CORTEZ DISSENTED.

Noting that the signage was posted in the normal manner at this location, Mr. Gray requested input from the DRB regarding improvements in signage posting.

Addressing the neighbors, Councilman Littlefield noted that it is incumbent upon them to bring neighbors to the April 20th meeting. With regard to signage, Councilman Littlefield requested that the signage be placed perpendicular to the street as opposed to parallel. He suggested moving the sign on Mercer out to the front of the property.

Commissioner Hess suggested an initiative or a discussion to ensure mandatory DRB hearing notification similar to the current practice on matters appearing before the Planning Commission. He also suggested that a follow-up postcard be sent in addition to the "Heads-up" postcard, providing an additional opportunity for neighbors to be notified.

Mr. Gray committed to place the suggestion by Commissioner Hess on the annual review of text amendments for consideration.

Board Member Cortez opined that the color of the signs is excellent and suggested for effectiveness, that the signs be double sided and placed perpendicular to traffic. Mr. Gray concurred.

Noting that an overview of the transportation study is included in Board Member's packets, Vice-Chairman Jones suggested that Board Members review the documentation. He acknowledged that the study is just beginning, will likely come before the Board in a few months as an update and remains an issue that the Board is concerned about.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc